IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Carrie Ferrara Clark,

Plaintiff,

v.

City of Tucson,

Defendant.

No. CV-14-02543-TUC-CKJ

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Defendant's Motion for Clarification of the Court's Order. (Doc. 88.) Plaintiff filed a response, (Doc. 93), Defendant filed a reply (Doc. 94), and Plaintiff filed a Sur-Reply to Defendant's Reply to Plaintiff's Objections to Defendant's Motion for Clarification of the Court's Order (Doc. 96). Defendant's motion asks whether the Court's extension of discovery deadlines in its order (Doc. 86) "limited to the issues raised in the Third Amended Complaint" includes Defendant's Non-Uniform Interrogatories asking for clarification as to which facts alleged in the Third Amended Complaint apply to which claims.

Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint intended to clarify and streamline the claims going forward. In doing so, many claims were withdrawn and others were separated. Defendant's interrogatories request that the Plaintiff clarify the facts alleged for each claim. Because some claims have been dropped, it is reasonable to believe the aligned facts for those claims may have changed as well. Because the Third Amended Complaint not only adds facts but changes claims, the Court finds Defendant's interrogatories are

Case 4:14-cv-02543-CKJ Document 98 Filed 06/16/17 Page 2 of 2

appropriate and are limited to the issues raised in the Third Amended Complaint. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED Defendants Motion for Clarification of the Court's Order (Doc. 93) is GRANTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED limitation on discovery issues raised in the Third Amended Complaint shall not preclude responses to the Defendant's Third Set of Non-Uniform Interrogatories and Fourth Request for Production. Plaintiff shall respond by the time allowed in Fed.R.Civ.P. Rule 33(b)(2) and Rule 34(b)(2)(a). Dated this 15th day of June, 2017. Honorable Cinny K. Jorgenson United States District Judge